UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Norfolk Division

JAN 2 3 2013

CLERK, US DISTRICT COURT
NORFOLK, VA

	CLERK, US DIS NORFO
UNITED SATES OF AMERICA For the use and benefit of PROBUILD COMPANY, LLC,))
and	Civil Action No.: 2:11-cv-451
PROBUILD COMPANY, LLC	
Plaintiffs,))
v.))
EDMUND SCARBOROUGH, et al.,	
Defendants.)))

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On January 23, 2013 the Court held a hearing on the Plaintiff's, ProBuild Company, LLC's, Motion for Entry of Judgment and Attorney's Fees Against Edmund Scarborough for Willful and Knowing Refusal to Obey Conditions of Negotiated Settlement, filed on December 10, 2012, ECF No. 45. This Motion was referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge for a recommended disposition pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(B) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. ECF No. 47. Mr. Glen W. Thompson appeared on the Plaintiff's behalf, and Mr. Michael M. Miles appeared on behalf of the Defendant Edmund Scarborough.

At the commencement of the hearing the Court was advised by the Plaintiff's counsel that the settlement proceeds which were the subject of the instant motion had been paid over by the Defendant and received by the Plaintiff. Additionally, the Plaintiff withdrew its request for

attorney's fees. Accordingly, the Court RECOMMENDS that the Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of

Judgment and Attorney's Fees Against Edmund Scarborough for Willful and Knowing Refusal

to Obey Conditions of Negotiated Settlement be DENIED as moot.

By copy of this Report and Recommendation, the parties are notified that:

1. Any party may serve on the other party and file with the Clerk specific written

objections to the foregoing findings and recommendations within fourteen days from the date of

mailing of this Report and Recommendation to the objecting party, see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)

and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), computed pursuant to Rule 6(a) of the Federal Rules

of Civil Procedure, plus three days permitted by Rule 6(d) of these Rules. A party may respond

to another party's specific objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof.

See FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b).

2. A district judge shall make a de novo determination of those portions of this Report

and Recommendation or specified findings or recommendations to which objection is made. The

parties are further notified that failure to file timely objections to the preceding findings and

recommendations will result in a waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of this Court

based on such findings and recommendations. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S. Ct. 466, 88

L. Ed. 2d 435 (1985); Carr v. Hutto, 737 F.2d 433 (4th Cir. 1984); United States v. Schronce,

727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

Lawrence R. Leonard
United States Magistrate Judge

Lawrence R. Leonard
United States Magistrate Judge

Norfolk, Virginia January 23, 2013

2